REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6 and 34-59 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the Abstract, specification, drawings, and claims 1-6 are amended, and claims 34-59 are added. Claims 7-33 were withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Merely for the purpose of expediting prosecution of the application, claims 7-33 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The Abstract and specification are amended for clarification purposes, and contain no new matter. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to the Abstract due to informalities. The substitute Abstract filed herewith is responsive to the Examiner's comments, and thus the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action objects to claim 5 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) for allegedly being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendment made to claim 5 are responsive to the Examiner's comments, and that claim 5 further limits the subject matter of independent claim 1, from which it depends. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 meets the requirements of 37 CFR 1.75(c), and thus the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated

by Payne et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,647,231 (hereinafter "Payne"). The rejection is respectfully

traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an interface section connected to the

microcomputer and an external device and configured to perform a data exchange therebetween,

and a memory device configured to store operation history data of the load section, wherein the

microcomputer is configured to upload the stored operation history data to the external device,

and to download a plurality of new washer operation parameters from the external device and

store the downloaded parameters in the memory device. Payne neither discloses nor suggests

such features.

Payne discloses an appliance electronic control system 20 for coin operated appliances

which is controlled by a microcontroller 22 with RAM and ROM memory elements 23.

Input/output lines 24 output signals for activating various elements of the appliance and receive

inputs, and connectors H1, H2, and H3 mate with corresponding connectors on a wiring harness

connected to the appliance. A communications link 29 which includes an optical infrared

interface 30 is connected to a port of the microcontroller 22. This interface 30 receives

externally generated signals from a remote control unit 32. A user may use this remote control

unit 32 to communicate with the microcontroller 22 and monitor operating parameters of the

appliance, such as the amount of money collected by a particular coin operated commercial laundry machine.

The interface section recited in independent claim 1 is configured to connect the microcomputer and an external device, thus allowing operation history data of the load section to be uploaded to the external device, and a plurality of new washer operation parameters to be downloaded and stored in the memory device. In contrast, Payne's remote control unit 32 can not provide, for example, a user or a service man with the capability to collect and store operational wash data and download a plurality of new washer operation parameters from an external source based on the data collected. Further, this remote control unit 32 does not allow, for example, the appliance to be further linked to a source, such as, for example, an external database contained in a personal computer or a server, or the Internet, which could provide for download of additional washer operation parameters.

Payne further discloses that, by using the appliance electronic control system 20, an operator may control an entire fleet of laundry machines, including both washers and dryers, with a single appliance controller and with a single data stream. In this instance, the appliance electronic control system 20 takes the place of individual controls in each machine. However, Payne simply teaches the storage of a predetermined collection of wash programs from which a user may select, and does not disclose or suggest that new washer operation parameters can be accessed from an external source and provided to individual machines based on operational

history and user preferences. Thus, Payne does not disclose or suggest the interface section and memory device recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Payne, and thus the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn. Dependent claim 4, as well as objected to claim 5 and newly added claims 34-45 are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

Independent claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, a memory device configured to store operation history data of the load section, wherein the microcomputer is configured to upload the stored operation history data to an external device, to download a plurality of new washer operation parameters from the external device, and to store the downloaded operation parameters in the memory device. As set forth above, Payne neither discloses nor suggests such features. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 6 is not anticipated by Payne, and thus the rejection of independent claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn. Newly added claims 46-59 are also allowable in view of their dependency, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejects claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne in view of Newman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,897,671 (hereinafter "Newman"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

18

Dependent claims 2-3 are allowable over Payne at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features. Further, Newman fails to overcome the deficiencies of Payne, as Newman is merely cited to teach the use of flash memory. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-3 are also allowable over the applied combination, and thus the rejection of claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is

hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and

please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

Carol L. Druzbick
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 CLD/JKM:jlg
Date: April 2, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610